

<sup>1</sup>See also the discussion of the role of members in the second section of this paper.

Dept. Genetics, University of Wisconsin,  
Madison, 6, Wis.

**March 21, 1949.**

Dear Jacques,

I think that I can clarify some of my remarks on lactase adaptation.

Lac<sub>1-</sub> (e.g. Y-87, or better, stocks with less mutable alleles) does adapt semi-synaptically to lactose and converts it to galactose to a very slight extent on lactose to form galactosidase. The activity is scarcely if at all detectable with the following substrate concentrations of the order of 1% of wild type, either in intact cells or in extracts.

On galactose, this mutant does about as well as on lactose, perhaps reaching a slightly lower level of activity. On butyl galactoside, however, lactase is produced at practically the level of wild type, as shown by fermentation of lactose or splitting of o-NPG.

Recently, a mutant was obtained which throws a very disturbing element

into the situation. I do not know its genetic relationships, but call it, for the moment, Lac<sub>g-</sub>. This mutant does not ferment glucose, galactose or maltose, and lactose only very slowly. With appropriate selective media, suppressor mutations permitting the fermentation either of maltose, or lactose or both are obtained, but leaving the mutant still glucose-negative and galactose-slow. So here we have a mutant which ferments lactose much

more rapidly (when grown on lactose) than either glucose or galactose or methyl swig easier, probably because it can ferment both. It produces an adaptive galactosidase (i.e. measured on o-NPG) which so far seems to have the same general character as wild type. However, a preliminary experiment has been done once which suggests that we may have the same problem here as in the complete utilization of maltose, via amylose, in the ~~lactose~~ Mal/Glu- types, by the intact cells. Dried cells of wild type retain their capacity to ferment lactose (as they do of glucose and galactose), but in this suppressor-mutant, drying destroys the capacity to ferment lactose. Again, we have the dilemma: is there a second labile

enzyme which bypasses hexoses altogether in the utilization of these disaccharides, or there was dealing with a ~~markedly~~ labile function of the enzymes we already recognize, one which is dependent on the structural integrity of the cell. David Green, now at our Enzyme Institute, inclines, of course to the latter viewpoint, on the basis of his work on cyclophorase.

I haven't had time yet to think how this can be attacked experimentally.

With regard to the subject of lysogenicity in *Escherichia coli*:

In fact, our work has been somewhat diverted by the finding that *Escherichia coli* K-12 seed from the "predator" strain L.S. friend K-12 is lysogenic!, unrevealed until some susceptible and phage-free stock cultures were produced coincidentally with our irradiations to prepare strains of the also found in *Escherichia coli* K-12, the *Lac-* mutants. The "lambda"-negative mutants can then be reinfected by exposure to the phage, and become lysogenic again. We have been impelled to look into this situation both as a possible interference in our *Escherichia coli* crosses, and also in the normal and random *Lac+* *Lac-* crosses (which turns out to be unimportant, unless one parent happens to be lysogenic, the other not) and as a "transforming principle", or an "infecting agent" of "cytoplasmic inheritance". I would appreciate a favor from you if you can manage it without inconvenience to yourself, namely to ask your colleagues at the Institut Pasteur to send me the famous lysogenic *E. coli* of Lisbonne and Carriere, and if available *B. megatherium* 899 and *Escherichia coli* K-12, and if available sensitive indicator strains. I would also appreciate very much available reprints of publications in this field, or points of view on available evidence concerning this field. My thanks to you and to them.

If you can do the following will be (or will be having now) quite welcome.

If you see Boris Ephrussi and Harriett Taylor, please give them my best. Is Harriett working on pneumococcus? Esther read a manuscript of mine on the antibiotic activity of a dye, and she asked about Ephrussi's work on acriflavine on ~~yeast~~ yeast, and wondered whether the small-celled mutants had been Gram-stained. There are some vague reports that the *Escherichia coli* mutants and *Escherichia coli* did not stain that this dye may convert Gram+ bacteris to Gram-.

Please tell me what you know about *Escherichia coli* and *Escherichia coli*.

Regards as well to Prof. Lwoff,

Yours sincerely,  
John C. Brinkley, M.D., Ph.D.